

REMARKS

Favorable reconsideration of this application is respectfully requested in view of the following remarks.

Claims 1, 4-11, 20 and 22 are pending in this application. Claims 1 and 11 are independent. Claim 11 has been withdrawn by the Examiner. Accordingly, Claim 1 is the only independent claim at issue here. By this Amendment, Claims 1 and 5 are amended, and Claim 22 is added. Support for the amendments to Claims 1 and 5 can be found, for example, in Figs. 1 and 2 and on page 7, lines 3 and 4 of the specification. Support for Claim 22 can be found, for example, on page 7, lines 3 and 4 and page 8, lines 5 and 6 of the specification. No new matter is added.

The Official Action rejects independent Claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) in view of European Application Publication No. 1110431 to Castle et al. ("Castle"), or alternatively under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) in view of Castle and U.S. Application Publication No. 2001/0002982 A1 to Sarkhel et al. ("Sarkhel").

Independent Claim 1 recites a vehicular glazing panel comprising a pane of glass having opposite surfaces, a first electrically conductive component existing on one of the surfaces of the pane of glass which does not face another pane of glass of the glazing panel, and a second electrically conductive component joined to the first component by a lead-free solder. The lead-free solder includes tin in an amount less than 50% by weight and a mechanical stress modifier in the form of bismuth metal or antimony metal.

Castle discloses a heated window 1 in which a busbar 6 is embedded in an interlayer 23 between two glass plies 21 and 22 as shown in Fig. 2 of the reference (see also page 6, line 31 to page 7, line 1 of Castle). The Official Action takes the position that the busbar 6 corresponds to the claimed first electrically conductive

component. However, Castle's busbar 6 is embedded in the interlayer 23 whereas the first electrical component in the vehicular glazing panel at issue here is not so embedded. To better define this aspect of the vehicular glazing panel, Claim 1 is amended to recite that the first electrically conductive component exists on a surface of the pane of glass which does not face another pane of glass of the glazing panel as shown in the drawing figures. The busbar 6 in Castle is not positioned in the manner claimed.

The claim amendment also obviates that the Advisory Action's position regarding new matter. The Advisory Action believes that the electrically conductive component on the outer surface of the pane of a window glazing panel (e.g., rear-window glazing panel) may face "another" pane of glass of a different window (i.e., front windshield) of the vehicle. The above amendment clarifies that the surface of the pane of glass does not face another pane of glass *of the glazing panel*. Support for this clarifying amendment can be found, for example, in Figs. 1 and 2 of the application.

The background section of the present application describes how solder having characteristics such as recited in Claim 1 can reduce the occurrence or possibility of stress faults on the surface of the glass pane when electrical components on the glass pane surface are connected. Castle's focus is quite different. Castle describes known heated windows in which heating wires are embedded in a ply of interlayer material positioned between two glass panes. Castle points out that these known windows experience loss of electrical connection between the wires and the busbars. Castle addresses these problems by proposing a production process for producing the heated laminated window that is specifically selected to improve the electrical connection between the busbars and the heating

wires. The process involves subjecting the glass laminate to an autoclave step to adhere the interlayer material to the adjacent glass panes and also melt solder provided on the flux-coated surface of at least one of the busbars.

It is apparent that Castle is not concerned with stress faults occurring in glazings during soldering of glazings. Castle's interest in improving the electrical connection between the busbars and the heating wires embedded in interlayer material between two glass panes through use of an autoclave would lead one away from Castle's laminated window to result in the glazing panel construction recited in Claim 1.

Sarkhel fails to cure this deficiency. Thus, independent Claim 1 is patentable over Castle individually, and in with the Sarkhel disclosure.

Claims 4-10 and 20 are patentable over the applied references at least by virtue of their dependence from allowable independent Claim 1. These dependent claims also define additional distinguishing aspects of the glazing panel.

For example, Claim 5 defines that the first electrically conductive component at least partially exists on a fired-ink band provided on the one surface of the pane of glass.

The Official Action takes the position that element 26 shown in Fig. 2 of Castle corresponds to the fired-ink band ("obscuration band") recited in Claim 5. However, Castle states that the element 26 is a coating of low melting point solder, not an obscuration band. Castle discloses on page 6, lines 16 and 17 of the disclosure that the obscuration band is designated with reference numeral 20, and is provided between the interlayer 23 and the glass ply 21 (see Fig. 2 of Castle). The obscuration band 20 is not located in the manner recited in Claim 1 (on a surface of the glass ply which does not face another pane of glass). Accordingly, the busbar 6

("first electrically conductive component") does not at least partially exist on the obscuration band 20 as claimed. Sarkhel fails to overcome these deficiencies of Castle. Thus, Claim 5 is patentable over the applied references for at least these additional reasons.

Withdrawal of the rejections is respectfully requested.

Claim 22 is presented for consideration and recites that the first electrically conductive component is a printed layer of fired ink provided on the one surface of the pane of glass.

Castle does not disclose that the busbar 6 is a printed layer of fired ink, nor that such a layer of fired ink is provided on a surface of a ply of glass 21, 22 which does not face another ply of glass of the glazing panel. Sarkhel fails to overcome this deficiency of Castle. Thus, Claim 22 is patentable over the applied references for at least these reasons, as well as by virtue of its dependence from patentable independent Claim 1.

Should any questions arise in connection with this application or should the Examiner believe that a telephone conference with the undersigned would be helpful in resolving any remaining issues pertaining to this application the undersigned respectfully requests that he be contacted at the number indicated below.

Respectfully submitted,

BUCHANAN INGERSOLL & ROONEY PC

Date: August 17, 2010

By: /David R. Kemeny/
Matthew L. Schneider
Registration No. 32814

David R. Kemeny
Registration No. 57241

Customer No. 21839
703 836 6620